



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ABUSE OF CITIZENSHIP.

IMMIGRATION in large numbers to the United States is a fixed fact. That it is fraught with great advantages has been shown in a former number of this REVIEW. It is also undeniable that it is fraught with evils more or less dangerous to our national character. Our present purpose is to traverse and call attention to one of these evils, believing that if the general public can be imbued with a clear idea of its true character, the patriotism of the people will not be long in applying remedial measures and appropriate checks.

At the time of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, the people generally were of a high order, morally and religiously,—intelligent, enterprising, and industrious. Many Europeans of culture had been drawn hither by sympathy with the new political institutions, and it was expected by Madison, Hamilton, and their contemporaries that the future “emigrations” would be largely of persons of wealth and education. The names of Robert Morris, John Witherspoon, Albert Gallatin, and Joseph Priestley readily suggest themselves among those of men whose services shed luster upon the home of their adoption. The new, thinly-settled country was in need of immigration, and the people welcomed into the body politic all Europeans who came and would “support” the new Constitution against the assaults of monarchist or revolutionist. Ever since the establishment of our Government, it has been our policy to invite immigration, and the terms have never been materially changed.

The number of persons of foreign birth in the United States in June, 1880, was 6,679,943, the nationalities being represented as follows:

German Empire...	1,966,742	..	Wales.....	83,302
Ireland.....	1,854,571	..	Mexico.....	68,399
British America...	717,084	..	Denmark.....	64,196
England.....	662,676	..	Holland.....	58,090
Sweden.....	194,337	..	Poland.....	48,557
Norway.....	181,729	..	Italy.....	44,230
Scotland.....	170,136	..	Austria.....	38,663
France.....	106,971	..	Russia.....	35,722
China.....	104,541	..	Belgium.....	15,535
Switzerland.....	88,621	..	Luxemburg.....	12,836
Bohemia.....	85,361	..	Hungary.....	11,526

and so on down to 129 from Greenland. In passing, it is worthy of note that the Irish number 1,854,571, the British (English, Scotch, and Welsh), 916,114, and the British Americans, 717,084, in all, 3,487,769—hence, more than half of our foreign-born population speak English, and come to us accustomed to Anglo-Saxon rule. The Germans number 1,966,742; all the other nationalities, 1,225,432.

European governments are seldom called upon to confer citizenship upon aliens. With us, the wholesale method of granting citizenship has developed an abuse which is peculiarly American. Here, the applicant is endued with all the privileges of full citizenship after having lived in the country a specified time as a person of good character, upon simply renouncing his former allegiance, and taking an oath to "support the Constitution of the United States"; the petty cost of the transaction, about a dollar, often being paid for him. It is held by our Government that this renunciation absolutely frees him from all obligation to his former Government, and that the formal oath to support a Constitution he cannot interpret and has not even read suffices to entitle him to a new nationality. The recipient evidently does not renounce his ancient loves or hates, feuds or enmities. Thus it has become common for some adopted citizens, even while ignoring any identification with American comity and American friendship, to claim all the privileges accorded them by law, and to demand protection, after they have returned to their native land and are engaged in aiding and abetting movements, often violent, in opposition to the lawful authorities.

The oath itself is too often administered in a perfunctory manner and without the deliberation which should characterize judicial action. The application for naturalization must be

made in open court, and is subject to the rules of judicial procedure. The judge is to be satisfied, by oral testimony, that the applicant has resided here the time required; that he is a person of good moral character; that he is attached to the principles of the Constitution, and "well disposed to the good order and happiness" of the United States. Said Judge Benedict to a United States Grand Jury in New York, in 1868: "The acts (in naturalizations) are solemn judicial acts, and every time a judge of any court admits an alien to be a citizen of the United States, he declares in the presence of his fellow-men, and under his oath of office, that he is satisfied, from evidence produced before him, that the person so admitted to citizenship is entitled by law to be a citizen."

In Louisiana, during the presidential canvass in 1844, Judge Elliott issued "nearly four hundred certificates of naturalization in one day!" . . . "Twelve hundred oaths administered, and eight hundred witnesses examined as to the age, qualifications, residence, and moral character of the different persons naturalized in open court by the judge," in one day! For this Elliott was impeached, convicted, and removed from office. Again, in 1866, one judge in the city of New-York made eight hundred voters in a single day, and was not even impeached. In the same city, in 1868, 8468 certificates were issued upon the testimony of ten witnesses, one of whom swore that he personally knew 2162 of the applicants to be of good moral character. Another witness, in the presence of one judge, answered, on October 9th, for three hundred and twenty-five; October 10th, for three hundred and ninety-one; and October 12th, for three hundred and fifty-seven different persons. In view of such a burlesque as this, it seems as though judicial discretion is considered a useless hinderance,—we simply want more voters, and don't care how we get them!

"Thus bad begins, and worse remains behind."

Just before important elections, the great parties naturally and rightfully endeavor to secure voters among aliens entitled to citizenship; too commonly, however, the petty leaders get the votes whether or no. The indifference or stupidity of the new voter, and the shameful willingness of political managers, of all parties, to degrade American citizenship to secure votes for the

exigency, are exemplified by the fact that, in some instances, the certificate has been retained by the party agent, in order to control the new voter at subsequent elections. How elevating this jugglery, this audacious travesty of law, must be to the ideas of the nascent citizen! How it must impress him with the dignity and purity of the American ballot!

When large numbers of foreigners are thus transformed into American citizens, it is not to be wondered at if they have very crude ideas of their new relations. Accustomed to connect the idea of loyalty and allegiance with a ruler or a dynasty, and finding here no personification of government, they are at a loss to know where to place their loyalty, and to whom, or to what, it is due. The new citizen sees the people divided into contending political hosts; some incidental circumstance, it may be of neighborhood or acquaintance, inclines him to one of the parties. To him, American nationality is an abstraction, a political idea, not a visible power; on the other hand, the party consists of tangible friends, and is, perhaps, the exponent of a cherished principle. Hence, the mass of our aliens enthrone the party of their preference, and too frequently yield it the unquestioning allegiance they should render to the United States. If voters of Irish birth and parentage were as faithful to the traditions and underlying principles of the Government of the United States as they are to the promptings of their Irish traditions and to their party, it would put a new face on our foreign relations. Voters so destitute of the proper conception of loyalty to their adopted country cannot be expected to show that they are "well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same." On the contrary, it is clear that many of them do, and are beginning to claim the right to, jeopard the peace and quiet of the United States by aiding and abetting felonies intended to keep up national feuds in their former home. So far, this abuse is confined to the naturalized from Ireland. If adopted citizens of other nationalities were equally aggressive, as they already are equally numerous,—at least, in the case of the Germans,—we should have trouble enough on our hands. Legally citizens, these men deport themselves as refugees and conspirators, who have come upon neutral ground to carry on intrigues, to raise money, and to promote crime in the land from whence they came. If this particular use made of our citizenship by a certain class of Irishmen is lawful and allowable, it is equally law-

ful and allowable to men of other nationalities, and we are in danger of permitting our soil to become a political Alsatia. If an organization of Americans, whose ancestors colonized Massachusetts Bay, should avow its purpose to harass Mexico or Cuba, and collect money for that purpose, openly declaring their intention to carry on warlike operations, even without riotous accompaniments, in the territory of those friendly countries, our Government would stop their proceedings without loss of time. Whether it is that Irish-born citizens actually have rights that Americans have not, or that Americans have no rights that the Irish are bound to respect, or whether a general confidence exists in the forbearance of those whom Irish orators style the "plunderers of the world," which is not expected of other, even feeble, peoples, it looks as though the alien is encouraged in doing that from which the native is estopped and for which he is punished. Are we prepared to submit to this assumption that aliens, who are Americans only by grace and adoption, have greater privilege than those whose nationality is natural and inherent?

Whether the Irish in Ireland have or have not ground of complaint against their landlords or against their Government is a question with which the Irish in America, as American citizens, have nothing to do. They have no right to embroil themselves or our Government in foreign contentions. To attempt it, is, to say the least, a most ungracious return to the American people for the privilege of citizenship. When adopted citizens publicly and ostentatiously declare their purpose to inflict death and destruction upon persons and property belonging to a country with which we are in profound peace,—announcing their intention to destroy ships at sea, together with their inoffensive passengers and crews,—we have such a glaring defiance of American sentiment, and if not an actual violation of American law, so near an approach to it, as to make it worth while to consider whither we are drifting.

Notwithstanding the disgust created by the long catalogue of agrarian crimes in Ireland, and the well-known fact that the criminals derive encouragement as well as pecuniary support from their fellow-countrymen here, little or no public expression of disapproval or condemnation has been heard from any of our adopted Irish citizens, except, perhaps, in respect to the murders of Cavendish and Burke. That class of our public speakers who

are so prompt to fire the Irish heart have kept a most significant silence upon this topic, not because they really approve of the outrages, nor because the immense majority of the Irish-born voters approve of them, but because they dare not oppose the blatant men whose identification with desperate rascality abroad has made them a power in the slums here at home. Of the 1,854,571 natives of Ireland in this country, only a small percentage can be justly charged with abetting the crimes we allude to. It is their misfortune that they have been so shamefully misrepresented by self-appointed leaders; it will be their fault if they do not find a way to resent it. Unless they do repudiate these perversions of the privileges of citizenship, and insist upon the observance of the restraint which common sense dictates as an adjunct of naturalization, the question will suggest itself to the public mind: Should citizenship be conferred on those who show themselves unworthy of it? If a class or a nationality is prone to agrarian crimes, here or abroad, should that class or nationality be clothed with political power, to be exercised to the detriment of the whole people? Why should we confer political power upon men of a country with which we have but little to do, if that power is used to embarrass our relations with the very country whose commerce is to us of by far the first importance, and to which we are united more than to any other by common laws, common religious ideas, and common speech?

If the reckless Irish leaders and their willing followers are, in truth, so enamored of murder and rapine, they are unfit for citizenship in a civilized country; if they are but common swindlers, it is about time the law stopped them. For years, it has from time to time been announced that certain mysterious plans for the "liberation" of Ireland have been perfected; then, that "British gold" has seduced the "patriot"; and this game has been played again and again on American soil and by legalized American citizens. It would be difficult to conceive of anything more foolish and wicked than the "Fenian" raid upon Canada a few years ago. What had Canada ever done to injure Irishmen, or how could the Canadian Government redress grievances in Ireland? People who tolerate such impulsive, misguided, and demagogical leadership in America, as well as in Ireland, are incapable of self-government.

Obviously there exists a general supineness among Ameri-

cans in respect to the use made by aliens of the privileges of citizenship. If the American people were as jealous of their national reputation as European nations are, public opinion would be quickly aroused and end an abominable abuse. Even now, if the reflecting portion of the community would assert itself, and demand that American citizenship shall not be prostituted by the adopted citizen, nor by those who pander to him, the truckling political aspirants who play with fire could very soon be taught that promotion does not come that way. The fact that a candidate holds a low estimate of the duties, restraints, and obligations of American citizenship and of American honor should doom him to certain defeat. The surest way to stop pandering is to make it unprofitable.

As we write, an occurrence of the day supplies an illustration of the bellicose oratory so much in vogue at Irish meetings in this country. The orator was once a member of the Senate of the State of New York, elected as an American citizen, not as an Irish subject or refugee. He spoke as one having knowledge of what he affirmed, and declared that :

“There is an organization working for Ireland’s deliverance, and all the gold of the British Empire cannot corrupt it nor obtain its secrets. Notwithstanding the powerful resources of England, she has been able to find but a few poor traitors who have acted the part of suborned witnesses. (Hisses and prolonged applause.) What have these men done to hurt us? Nothing. All their testimony does not disclose a hint of the vast power that is to overwhelm the proud empire of England, and the day is speedily coming when it will not be a crime to be a patriot in Ireland. We shall continue to instil venom in every land against these plunderers of the world. It is the duty of all Irishmen in this country to bring about war between the United States and Great Britain. (Cheers.) Put Irishmen in high places — into the State Legislature, into national offices, into the Cabinet of the United States — and they will do their work well.”

Such frothy utterances bring votes to the men who pronounce them, consequently there is a constant temptation to politicians of a certain sort to indulge in such idiocy. But the effect upon the illiterate and indiscriminating hearer is to lead him to suppose that agrarian crimes in Ireland are commendable, and that the ferocity of a handful of Irish assassins and their sympathizers is of more political consequence than the peace and well-being of fifty millions of Americans.

Contrast the spirit of this vaporizing orator with the solid wisdom of the framers of the Constitution in the Federal Conven-

tion of 1787. No one in that assembly expected that men would import to this country the feuds and animosities of Europe. The opinion prevailed that the foreigners who would come would belong to the well-to-do and intellectual classes, and that many of them would be "called" to serve the public in Congress. During the discussion respecting the length of time an alien must be a citizen before being eligible to the United States Senate, Mr. Gouverneur Morris moved to insert fourteen years instead of four years, urging the danger of admitting strangers into the public councils. Mr. Ellsworth and Mr. Madison were opposed to the motion as discouraging meritorious aliens from emigrating to this country. Mr. Pinckney said there was peculiar danger and impropriety in opening the Senate's doors to those who have foreign attachments. Mr. Pierce Butler, of South Carolina (an Irishman), "was decidedly opposed to the admission of foreigners without a long residence in the country. He acknowledged that if he had been called into public life within a short time after his coming to America his foreign habits, opinions, and attachments would have rendered him an improper agent in public affairs." Mr. Randolph would agree to seven years. Mr. Wilson mentioned the circumstance of his not being a native, and the possibility of his being incapacitated from holding a place under the Constitution he aided to make.

In regard to the term of residence required of an alien-born Representative in Congress, "Colonel Mason was for opening a wide door for emigrants, but did not choose to let foreigners and adventurers make laws for us and govern us." He moved that seven years instead of three be inserted. Mr. Williamson was against naming any period, saying: "New residents, if elected, will be most zealous to conform to the will of their constituents, as their conduct will be watched with a more jealous eye." Mr. Gerry wished eligibility to be confined to natives. Mr. Williamson said: "Wealthy emigrants do more harm, by their luxurious examples, than good by the money they bring with them." Mr. Madison concurred; he wished to invite foreigners of merit and republican principles. Mr. Wilson cited Pennsylvania as a proof of the advantages of encouraging "emigrations." Three of her deputies to this Convention were not natives—Mr. Robert Morris, Mr. Fitzsimons, and himself.

How amazed would these ancient worthies be if they could hear such harangues as are common now! Happily for them, they could not foresee that we no longer "call" meritorious aliens, or natives either, into the public councils. We have bravely outgrown the decorum and sincerity of the Fathers, and the orator we have quoted is a specimen of a class that can always be depended upon to accept seats in high places, in the State Legislature, in national offices, and even in the Cabinet of the United States. Of political offices among us, it may be said, in the language of Scripture, they suffer violence, and the violent take them by force, whether "called" or not.

Butler, the Irishman, as well as his colleagues, was honestly seeking the best interests of his adopted country. His patriotism was devoid of malice and allied to his intelligence, while both were devoted to the great work of constructing a Constitution for a new and undeveloped country. Yet it does not appear in the Madison papers that he ever insisted that it was the duty of Scotchmen to bring about war between the United States and Great Britain, nor to put Irishmen into the Cabinet of the United States. A patriot of prudence and sagacity, he disdained that sort of talk, and left it for the exclusive use of "gentlemen" seeking Irish votes in 1883.

How much or how little self-respect and conscience is to be found in men who noisily present themselves as advocates of violence abroad, and thus sow the seeds of violence at home, is not for us to say. Such appeals are not made to the most intelligent classes, but to the least so; nevertheless, the observing public usually credits demagogues with a considerable share of discernment in their pursuit of place—that greatest good which comes from the greatest number. To these gentlemen, who so easily accommodate their views to circumstances, the following table, giving the number, nationality, and percentage of foreign-born inhabitants of the United States in four census years, may be of interest:

<i>Irish.</i>			<i>British.</i>		<i>British Am.</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
1850...	961,719	43.5	379,093	17.1	147,711	6.7
1860...	1,611,304	38.9	587,775	14.2	249,970	6.0
1870...	1,855,827	33.3	770,414	13.8	493,464	8.7
1880...	1,854,571	27.7	916,114	13.	717,084	10.7

	<i>German.</i>		<i>All others.</i>		<i>Total.</i>
	<i>No.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	
1850...	583,774	26.4	138,542	6.3	2,210,839
1860...	1,301,136	31.2	385,990	9.3	4,136,175
1870...	1,690,533	30.3	756,991	13.6	5,567,229
1880...	1,966,742	29.4	1,225,432	18.	6,679,943

The British and British Americans in 1880 aggregated 1,633,198—23.7 per cent.

Immigration from Ireland has culminated. It is scarcely possible that the Green Isle can continue to send such numbers as in former years. The Irish-born residing here in 1880 were actually less, by 1300, than ten years before. In 1880, the Germans exceeded them by 112,000, and the numerical ascendancy of the Irish vanished. The steadily increasing numbers of the other nationalities named are so striking as to make comment superfluous. When it is remembered that immigration from countries other than Ireland has already attained such dimensions, and that the population of

Ireland	(1881), is.....	5,159,839
Germany.....	(1880), “	45,194,172
Great Britain ...	(1881), “	30,086,723
British America.	(1881), “	4,352,080

it is seen to be almost certain that the percentage of the Irish must decline, even more rapidly than it has during the last thirty years. This is verified by the following figures, taken from official reports: During eleven years, ending June 30, 1882, 3,949,264 immigrants arrived from all parts of the world. Of the nationalities considered, the arrivals were as follows:

English.....	528,747	
Irish	528,206	
Scotch.....	109,685	
Welsh	8,517	
		1,175,155
German		1,096,743
American (mainly British American)		582,782

If we add to the British, say 525,000 for British Americans, the total will, without the Irish, exceed the Germans; while the English alone outnumber the Irish. Again, in eight months, ending March 31st, the arrivals were, from

	1882.	Per cent.	1883.	Per cent.
England and Wales	54,318	12.3	46,230	13.6
Ireland	34,507	7.8	25,014	7.3
Scotland	10,773	2.4	7,611	2.2
Canada	62,397	14.	45,119	13.3
Germany	148,481	33.7	116,056	34.2
All others	129,851	29.5	99,184	29.2
	440,327	99.7	339,214	99.8

These tables are also kindly commended to the attention of young, pushing politicians, who are shrewd enough to anticipate the inevitable. The decay of Irish influence in this country is certain, and will be the political destruction of those preachers of sedition who build their hopes upon a bad foundation. In politics, it is said that "a blunder is worse than a crime." We are not so bold as to say these men would hesitate at the crime; they may hesitate at the blunder.

Popular discontent has usually manifested itself in Ireland, under the machinations of secret organizations of an agrarian character. Such societies, under the names of United Irishmen, White-boys, Peep-o'-day-boys, Ribbonmen, Rockites, Fenians, Land Leagues, and Invincibles, and under the lead of desperadoes, have controlled large numbers of people, and in some sections have for awhile defied the Government itself.

All the Irish societies in this country profess benevolent and worthy objects, but some of them have used the garb of benevolence and religion to further malign and nefarious purposes. They perpetuate foreign feuds, and keep alive race distinctions, both of which are out of place here, and should be made to disappear in the broader life of America. Scheming men, to further their own ambition, flatter and applaud the prejudices of the members; thus the societies become important agents in elections, and, knowing their power, do not scruple to

"—deal damnation round the land
On each they judge their foe."

The murders and other atrocities committed by the Fenians in Ireland, and the Irish Mollie Maguires in Pennsylvania, stamp them with a strong family likeness. These secret societies arrogate to themselves the functions of prosecutor, judge, jury, and executioner. From their mandate there is no appeal; the signal given, the victim is doomed. The same illogical and brutal

spirit exists in each. In quick sympathy for fugitive criminals, in the mystery of their movements, in contempt for the condemnation of their Church, and in reckless abandonment of restraint, human or divine, the two conspiracies are alike. In both, the object is not robbery, but revenge and murder; and this shocking intent, by some strange beguilement, is gloried in as a resource of patriotism. Should such mental and moral confusion ever attain the ascendancy, it would overturn civilization and bring back chaos and black night again.

If we had observed that, for a long time, violence, arson, and murder had been perpetrated without apparent motive and without detection, so that we were driven to suspect the existence of a secret organization for the purpose of directing the crimes and shielding the criminals, we should doubtless be able to sympathize with the law-abiding people in Ireland, and the difficult task of their protectors and rulers. If we should find that the law-breakers—claiming to be actuated by patriotic motives and to be jealous of their nation's name and religious belief, admitting to membership only inheritors of the one and believers in the other—are actually under the ban of excommunication, we should be still more impressed with the thoroughly Irish character of their pretensions. If the sense of fear and apprehension of a grim and gigantic conspiracy had hung like a pall over a large district which had been converted into a theater of revolting crimes, whose victims were sometimes prominent and sometimes obscure; if we felt assured that behind the meaner man who shot the pistol or drove home the knife there stood others in higher life, far more guilty; if we were cognizant of all these things, and saw the Government striving, but scarcely able to grant deliverance,—our hearts would ache with pity for that land. With the events of the past months in memory, we should suspect that this secret organization, criminal in its character, criminal even in its purpose, would have a political object in view. We should not be surprised to learn that its members were town councillors, or even in Parliament. If we heard that the leaders were pardoned, and in "treaty" with the Executive, we should still control our wonder, because the whole is so peculiarly and characteristically Irish. The suppositions are realities. Every day we read the story of these villainous outrages in unhappy Ireland, and are confronted by the fact that the money which supports them is drawn from so-called Ameri-

can pockets, and that the supply is greater after an outrage uncommonly wicked.

Will immigration bring to these shores such shocking depravity? Will not the universal school-house, the multiplication-table, reading, writing, and arithmetic sweetly subdue all such villainy? It has already come. The Ancient Order of Hibernians domesticated this progeny of evil in the Schuylkill County coal-fields of Pennsylvania years ago. The very words we have employed in our supposition are taken from the report of the trial of one of the indicted members of the society named, and known in the locality as Molly Maguires. The story is substantially true, whether we read it Schuylkill County or Ireland, commissioner of the county or town councillor. Mr. Franklin B. Gowen, counsel for the Commonwealth, said:

“When these assassins speak of being Catholics, I desire to say that they have been denounced by their Church, and excommunicated by their prelates, and that I have the direct personal authority of Archbishop Wood himself to say that he denounces them all. . . . You will find the leaders prominent men in the townships. . . . One of the commissioners of this county is a member. A former commissioner of this county was a member of this order, convicted of a high offense, and pardoned by the Governor. High constables, chiefs of police, candidates for associate judges, were guilty of murder. When the time comes that all may be told to the world, it will be such a history as will make every American citizen hang his head with shame. I have seen a society of murderers and assassins having its members in the highest place of this county. I have seen them elected to fill the positions of constables and police officers. I have seen a trusted member of that band of murderers a commissioner of the county. I have seen this organization wield a political power in the State, which has controlled the election of a great Commonwealth. I have received the information of meetings between some of the highest officers of the State and the chief of the murderers, at which large sums of money were paid to secure the votes of this infernal association, to turn the tide of a State election.”

In Pennsylvania, the criminals were hunted down, and the crimes stopped. The Irish in Ireland did not send aid and comfort to criminals here, nor in any way interfere with the process of our courts. In Ireland, the difficulties are far greater; therefore, the people, as well as their Government, have a right to expect of us, at least, the friendship of a silent sympathy, instead of an embarrassing interference, prompted by a desire to propitiate the turbulent, not the peaceable Irish element here. There was no pretense of inequality before the law in Pennsylvania, nor of extortionate rents, nor of undue governmental restraints.

Neither, on the other hand, did the State adjust or scale down rents to suit the necessities of tenants. But in the coal regions, a reign of terror existed of precisely the same in kind as has so often reigned in parts of Ireland. As the victims in Ireland represented a political power obnoxious to their murderers, or else private persons who had incurred their hostility—so, in Pennsylvania, the victims represented, in some capacity, the corporations controlling the mining business, or were persons who had offended the ruffians. Here, as in Ireland, the plots were unraveled, and men in higher station were implicated as ringleaders. At this point the resemblance stops. It is due to the Mollie Maguires to admit that they did not run to Ireland or France for shelter, nor even to take up a collection. Few of the mad revolutionists here, who pretend to be anxious to drive the British out of Ireland, evince any great desire to engage in the work themselves. If a hundred or two of them would only go to Ireland at once, they would at least seem consistent, and gratify Americans as well as the British people. But they will not go; they know that here they may “live long and prosper.” The sum of their Irish patriotism is expressed in the old formula: “We are opposed to the cholera, and in favor of the next war with England.” They also know that if that patriotism, which Johnson defined as “the last refuge of scoundrels,” should fail to render them an ample support, they can, as a last resort, open bar-rooms, become aldermen, get rich, and hope to die in the odor of sanctity.

And the sting of it all is that it is true. As a people, we have debased our citizenship so low, that when we know it is abused we make no sign. Neither of the great political parties dares to raise the standard of duty and obligation, or to oppose the mischievous clap-trap of the day. If the Chinese had been voters, and even one-third as numerous as the Irish, they would have been welcomed—not excluded. The power to remedy the abuse of American citizenship lies in the assertion of American patriotism. When a candidate is known to be in sympathy with men who are in name, not at heart, American, their support should be sufficient cause to insure his overwhelming defeat. We want no divided allegiance, no tools of foreigners, to “make laws for us and govern us,” or to force the United States into one policy or another. All Americans, native or naturalized, owe it to themselves and their country to take a high stand upon this

matter. The quick defeat of a few candidates for obscure as well as conspicuous places would be a salutary lesson to politicians who generally respect the teachings of adversity.

There is no danger now that immigration will bring hither advocates of monarchy or nobility; consequently, it is not so important that aliens should swear to support the Constitution as it is that they should emphasize their accession to the rights of citizenship, by a solemn pledge to obey the laws, and to utterly renounce their former national and race antipathies. If they object to these conditions, they should not be trusted with the privileges citizenship confers; their naturalization would be only a sham, and themselves unnecessary additions to the number of irresponsible and inconsiderate voters.

Naturalized citizens should not be entitled to vote until they have resided in the State at least a year after their admission to citizenship. In this respect, they should be placed upon an equality with natives,—citizens from birth,—who are required in New York and other States to be residents for twelve months before they can vote. If this change were made, it would put an end to the corruption attending wholesale naturalizations in the heat of elections, and the courts could consider the applications according to the intent of the law.

Incorporation is a privilege granted to associations on the ground of public utility. It follows, logically, that it is an abuse and a fiction to incorporate a secret society of any kind. This abuse becomes intensely pernicious when such a society is formed of foreigners of one nationality and their immediate descendants, and must, of necessity, foster alien interests in the hearts of those who ought to be devoted to their adopted country. The objection may be raised that these restrictions are uncalled for; we have done without them so far, and they will tend to diminish the volume of immigration which is so valuable. In reply, we say, the abuses we have considered would not have existed, or would have been much less offensive, if such measures had been taken early. The experience of a century of virtually unrestricted citizenship for aliens has gradually developed these evils, and has plainly taught us that the accessions of foreigners are due to the prospect of material advantages, far more than to philosophical principles or political rights. Cheap land and cheap transportation will as effectively induce emigration to the United States in the future as in the past, and if no more aliens

should be granted the right to vote, it would probably not lessen the volume of immigration to any appreciable extent.

Notwithstanding the inducements offered by the British Colonies to British emigrants in the reduction of rates and otherwise, about three-fourths of all the native emigrants from the United Kingdom go to the United States. During the period 1853-1880, the emigrants from Great Britain and Ireland were distributed as follows:

	<i>To the United States.</i>	<i>To British Nor. Amer.</i>	<i>To Australia and New Zealand.</i>	<i>All other Countries.</i>	<i>Total.</i>
English.....	69,081 ..	13,541 ..	15,176 ..	14,047 ..	111,845
Scotch	14,471 ..	3,221 ..	3,059 ..	1,305 ..	22,056
Irish.....	83,018 ..	4,140 ..	5,949 ..	534 ..	93,641
Foreign	88,801 ..	8,434 ..	1,253 ..	1,881 ..	100,369
Unknown.....	1,903 ..	4 ..	1 ..	2,475 ..	4,383
	<u>257,274</u>	<u>29,340</u>	<u>25,438</u>	<u>20,242</u>	<u>332,294</u>

The German emigration is almost entirely to this country.

It may be proper to add, what no right-minded person would question, that there is not, and never has been, any unwillingness here to aid suffering humanity in Ireland or elsewhere. The Irish-Americans have been profuse in their contributions to their kindred in Ireland, and have been respected for it. When the Bennett Fund was raised for the starving in Ireland, and when our Germans sent money the other day for the benefit of the sufferers by the Rhine inundations, every one knew those large sums would be applied to those purposes exclusively. But when any of our people—native or naturalized, high or low—collect money under the guise of charity, and use it to aid treason and felony on the territory of a friendly power, they deserve the rebuke General Butler administered to a New York mob in 1868: "You are not fit for the exercise of the elective franchise, and in no better way could you demonstrate the fact."

EDWARD SELF.